



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/500,712

08/16/2004

Juha-Pekka Koskinen

59643.00491

7200

32294 7590 12/31/2007
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P.
14TH FLOOR
8000 TOWERS CRESCENT
TYSONS CORNER, VA 22182

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, TUAN HOANG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2618

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/31/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/500,712	Applicant(s) KOSKINEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Tuan H. Nguyen	Art Unit 2618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 January 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 09/24/2007 with respect to claims 1-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 5, 10-12, 13-15, 17, 22-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lippelt (US PUB. 2005/0136890) in view of Wise et al. (U.S. PAT. 5,826,185 hereinafter, "Wise").

Consider claims 1, 13, and 25-27, Lippelt teaches charging against prepaid credit in a communication network, comprising: requesting establishment of a call between a first terminal and a second terminal (page 2 [0015]); ascertaining whether any costs generated by accounting clients in the network, and associated with the call, are to be charged against prepaid credit (page 1 [0007]); in the event some or all of the costs are

to be charged against prepaid credit, establish an accounting session between the accounting server and the accounting client that will generate the costs to be charged against the prepaid credit, the accounting session being allocated an accounting session identifier (see fig. 3 page 5 [0050]); and establish the call with the second terminal (page 2 [0020]).

Lippelt does not explicitly show that the sending charging update data from the accounting client to the accounting server during the call; and collating the charging update data in the accounting server based on the accounting session identifier, thereby enabling updating of the prepaid credit during the call, where the charging update data includes the accounting session identifier.

In the same field of endeavor, Wise teaches the sending charging update data from the accounting client to the accounting server during the call (fig. 2(e) col. 4 lines 27-44 i.e., a periodic recheck is made to see if CPU has minutes remaining (symbol 408) and if not, the system goes to the HANGUP FUNCTION (symbol 405). If minutes are still available, the system returns to the main routine); and collating the charging update data in the accounting server based on the accounting session identifier, thereby enabling updating of the prepaid credit during the call, where the charging update data includes the accounting session identifier (fig. 2(e) col. 4 lines 27-44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use, the sending charging update data from the accounting client to the accounting server during the call; and collating the charging update data in the accounting server based on the accounting session identifier, thereby

enabling updating of the prepaid credit during the call, where the charging update data includes the accounting session identifier, as taught by Wise, in order to provide a cellular telephone system wherein air time use is controlled in accordance with the amount of money prepaid by the cellular phone user.

Consider claims 2 and 14, Lippelt teaches there are a plurality of accounting clients that generate costs in relation to the call, comprising: establish accounting sessions between each respective accounting client and the accounting server, each of the accounting sessions being allocated a common accounting session identifier associated with the call to be established (fig. 3 page 5 [0050]).

Lippelt does not explicitly show that sending charging update data to the accounting server during the call, the charging update data including the accounting session identifier; and collating the charging update data from each of the accounting clients based on the accounting session identifier, thereby enabling updating of the prepaid credit during the call.

In the same field of endeavor, Wise teaches sending charging update data to the accounting server during the call, the charging update data including the accounting session identifier (fig. 2(e) col. 4 lines 27-44); and collating the charging update data from each of the accounting clients based on the accounting session identifier, thereby enabling updating of the prepaid credit during the call (fig. 2(e) col. 4 lines 27-44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use, sending charging update data to the accounting

Art Unit: 2618

server during the call, the charging update data including the accounting session identifier; and collating the charging update data from each of the accounting clients based on the accounting session identifier, thereby enabling updating of the prepaid credit during the call, as taught by Wise, in order to provide a cellular telephone system wherein air time use is controlled in accordance with the amount of money prepaid by the cellular phone user.

Consider claims 3 and 15, Lippelt further teaches the accounting server is located in the home network of the first terminal (page 1 [0012]).

Consider claims 5 and 17, Lippelt further teaches configured such that the accounting session identifier is allocated upon receipt in the network of the request for establishment of a call from the first terminal (page 6 [0058]).

Consider claims 10 and 22, Lippelt further teaches configured to ascertain whether costs are to be charged against prepaid credit by looking up subscriber profile data upon receipt of the request for establishment of the call (page 3 [0028]).

Consider claims 11 and 23, Lippelt further teaches the network is an IP-network (page 5 [0056]).

Consider claims 12 and 24, Lippelt further teaches the network is a UMTS network (page 5 [0048]).

4. Claims 4 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lippelt in view of Wise as applied to claims above, and further in view of Cobo et al. (U.S PAT. 6,496,690 hereinafter, "Cobo").

Consider claims 4 and 16, Lippelt and Wise, in combination, fails to teaches each accounting client takes the form of one of the following network entities: SGSN/GGSN; S-CSCF/P-CSCF; and a network application server.

However, Cobo teaches each accounting client takes the form of one of the following network entities: SGSN/GGSN; S-CSCF/P-CSCF; and a network application server (col. 4 line 65 through col. 5 line 12).

Therefore, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the disclosing of Cobo into view of Lippelt and Wise, in order to provide a prepaid subscriber service to a mobile subscriber in an integrated wireless telecommunications network having a circuit-switched portion and a General Packet Radio Service (GPRS) packet-switched portion.

5. Claims 6-9 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lippelt in view of Wise as applied to claims above, and further in view of Chaney (U.S PAT. 6,947,724).

Consider claims 6 and 18, Lippelt and Wise, in combination, fails to teaches the request for establishment of a call is made via a Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) message sent from the first terminal.

However, Chaney teaches the request for establishment of a call is made via a Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) message sent from the first terminal (col. 1 lines 16-39).

Therefore, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the disclosing of Chaney into view of Lippelt and Wise, in order to provide billing a call placed by a user based on a reported traffic load in the network.

Consider claims 7 and 19, Chaney further teaches the charging update data is sent from the accounting clients to the accounting server via a Diameter protocol message (col. 8 lines 1-6).

Consider claims 8 and 20, Chaney further teaches the charging update data is sent from each accounting client to the accounting client in response to a Diameter protocol update request issued by the accounting server (see fig. 5 col. 8 lines 7-14).

Consider claims 9 and 21, Chaney further teaches the accounting server issues the update requests to each accounting client periodically (col. 8 lines 43-53).

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Mail Stop_____ (Explanation, e.g., Amendment or After-final, etc.)

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Facsimile responses should be faxed to:

(571) 273-8300

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22313

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan H. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571)272-8329. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00Am - 5:00Pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Maung Nay A. can be reached on (571)272-7882882. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tuan Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2618

T.N


NAY MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER